COMMENTS ON THE ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF *GRYLLUS SANGUINIPES* FABRICIUS, 1798. Z.N.(S.) 1695

(see volume 22, pages 105–107)

By K. H. L. Key (*Division of Entomology, C.S.I.R.O., Canberra, Australia*)

I write to support the substance of the request to the Commission by Kevan and Vickery. It is much to be regretted that the name *sanguinipes* was brought into use in 1962, notwithstanding Art. 23(b) of the Code, and notwithstanding that, even before the 1961 revision of the Code, this name could have been suppressed by the Commission under its plenary powers. Nevertheless, as Kevan and Vickery explain, even in the short period since 1962 *sanguinipes* has come into general use for the economic species concerned, while the name *bilituratus*, under which it was previously known, had been current for no longer period, and names current earlier are inapplicable for taxonomic reasons. Thus only further confusion could result now from rejection of *sanguinipes*.

However, Kevan and Vickery have clearly misunderstood Art. 23(b). There is no possibility of " a name long in confusion . . . remaining in confusion by the application of Article 23(b) "; nor does the Commission have to "set aside" 23(b) in order to validate *sanguinipes*. Since it would be unfortunate if such an interpretation of Art. 23(b) were to pass unchallenged, I wish to draw explicit attention to the fact that this Article requires the Commission to make a decision as to whether a *nomen oblitum* is to be rejected *or conserved*, depending upon which action " better serves the stability and universality of nomenclature ". In fact, Kevan and Vickery's application is wrongly framed in so far as it requests the Commission to " set aside " Art 23(b): it should request the Commission to apply Art. 23(b)—in the sense of placing *sanguinipes* on the appropriate Official List. Moreover, it should be noted that such action by the Commission, being in accordance with the Code and not under suspension of it, does not invoke the Commission's plenary powers.

By R. L. Edwards (*Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada*)

I would like to support the proposals put forward by the authors as the name *sanguinipes* appears to have been adopted by most authors on this side of the Atlantic, and I think even more chaos would result if an attempt were made to change it now.

FURTHER OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF A NEOTYPE FOR *CANCER SETIFERUS* L. 1767 (CRUSTACEA DECAPODA). Z.N.(S.) 1617

(see volume 21, pages 227–234)

By Gordon Gunter (*Gulf Coast Research Laboratory, Ocean Springs, Mississippi, U.S.A.*)

Dr. L. B. Holthuis has answered my objection to his proposal for a neotype for *Cancer setiferus* L. 1767. I am sorry to have to burden the Commission with further arguments, but some new things have been brought up that deserve comment.[1]

I shall reply to Doctor Holthuis' points as he enumerated them (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** (3) : 232–234, 1964).

1 & 2. He says (*op. cit.*, p. 232), " As to the type locality of *Cancer setiferus*, this is per definition the locality where the type specimen, i.e. Seba's specimen, was collected. Of this locality we do not know anything in print or otherwise ". The statement is incorrect. Seba's specimen was American as stated in the name of the animal, and it has always been accepted as such. By the same token Linnaeus had a right to restrict the type locality and he did by " *in Indiis* " in the original description. I have pointed out previously (Gunter, *Gulf Res. Repts.* **1** (3), 1962) that Gmelin (*Syst. Nat.* 14th ed., 1790) Herbst (1796) and Olivier (1811) variously listed the shrimp from South America and India, America, and South America. Also Houttuyn (1769, *Nat. Hist.* **13** : 434), S. Muller (1775, *Natursyst.* **5** : 1133), Olivier (1791, *Encycl. méth.*

---

[1] I shall be glad to supply the Commissioners with copies of the initial four papers on this subject by Doctor Holthuis and me, which he mentioned (*Bull. zool. Nomen.* **21** (3) : 227)